

### REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated November 5, 2004. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone conference on February 28, 2005, regarding the allowable subject matter contained in Claims 26 and 27. Claims 1-8, 10-19 and 22-27 are pending. Claims 1-19 and 22-25 have been rejected. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled and claims 20-21 have been previously cancelled. No new matter has been added with this amendment. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 12, 17-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unobvious over Chu in view of Lobanoff. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Applicants' assertions regarding the rejections will be discussed with respect to independent claim 1, as the Examiner's assertions with regard to the rejection of claim 1 are similar to the Examiner's assertions with regard to the rejection of claims 2-8, 12, 17-19 and 22.

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of obviousness requires both (1) a suggestion of the prior art to make and use the claimed device and that (2) one skilled in the art would be reasonably expected to make and use the compositions or device, or in carrying out the claimed process. In the instant case, the cited references, either alone or in combination, meet neither of these requirements.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 has been amended with elements from allowable claim 26. The amended claim 1 is directed to a tiltable headrest allowing "... the seat occupant to increase comfort and/or promote a better monitor-viewing angle for passengers of varying heights" (Original Specification, p. 6, lines 17-19).

Firstly, Chu recites " that the mobile video device 3 is movable up and down along the displacement rails 43" (Chu, col. 2, lines 50-53). Chu in summary teaches, suggests, and motivates that the mobile video device may be moved vertically without having the ability, as shown in Fig. 2 of Chu, for the video display device in the headrest support being tilt-able.

In contrast to the Chu reference, the amended claim 1 of the present invention, which includes the apparently allowable subject matter of claim 26, recites "... said headrest support being tilt-able in relation to said at least one hollow pillar to a plurality of forward tilted positions, ... said headrest pillow being sized and shaped to provide a video display housing ...". Thus, amended claim 1 teaches a headrest support having a plurality of forward tilted positions and

the headrest pillow including a video display housing is novel over Chu merely teaching or suggesting that the mobile video device may be moved vertically.

Furthermore, the teachings, suggestions, and motivations provided by Lobanoff do not cure the defects of Chu. More specifically, Lobanoff is directed to " mount[ing] on the top of a vehicle front seat 11 and incorporating a lighted vanity mirror assembly 12 comprising an open plastic receptacle 22, in which is disposed a mirror housing 20 supporting the mirror 13 ... and a cover 16 having a fabric hinge 17 ..." (Lobanoff, col. 3, lines 38-45, Fig. 3). Lobanoff merely teaches, suggests, or motivates placing a mirror having a cover within the rear of a vehicle seat. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Chu even in combination with Lobanoff, does not teach, suggest, or motivate the amended claim 1 including a video display device mounted in a tiltable headrest.

In view of the above arguments, it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and, therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references as are 2-8, 12, 17-19 and 22, which depend from claim 1.

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu and Lobanoff in view of Ikeda et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Even if Ikeda is asserted, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that Ikeda fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Chu and Lobanoff references. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully asserted that claims 9-11 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1 over the cited references.

Claims 13-16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu and Lobanoff as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Dixon (U.S. Patent No.5,507,556). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Even if Dixon is asserted, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that Dixon fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Chu and Lobanoff references. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully asserted that claims 13-16 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1 over the cited references.

Claims 23-25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu and Lobanoff as applied to the claims above, and further in view of ul Azam et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Even if ul Azam is asserted, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that ul Azam fails to overcome

the deficiencies of the Chu and Lobanoff references. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. It is respectfully asserted that claims 23-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 1 over the cited references.

Allowance of Claims 26 and 27

Applicants appreciate the recognition that claims 26 and 27 have allowable subject matter and are allowable as presented. Claims 26 and 27 have been amended to correct for inadvertent errors and further clarify the inventive features of the present invention.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the present Amendment places claims 1-8, 10-19, and 22-27 of the present application in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: March 4, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Robert E. Kasody  
Registration No. 50,268  
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka  
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: 213-623-2221  
Facsimile: 213-623-2211